



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

I. Comment by DAVID EUGENE SMITH, Ph. D., Professor of Mathematics, Michigan State Normal School, Ypsilanti, Mich.

This question seems to me to have no interest to mathematicians. It simply means that somebody has set up a narrow definition of multiplication and has then said, "Your work is not multiplication because it does not fit *my* definition." I expressed my humble opinion in the MONTHLY some time ago when the antiquated definition of division was brought up to prove that it was impossible to divide \$10 by 2. Such narrow limitations seem to me utterly nonsensical.

In a similar sense we cannot multiply by  $-1$ , and we cannot have "imaginary numbers," and 1 is not a number, etc., etc. Mathematical progress has always been made the more difficult because somebody has insisted on hanging on to some antiquated definition.

What do these people who say that we cannot multiply 2 by 3 say to some such simple formula as  $e^{\pi i} = -1$ ? I suppose they say that  $e$ ,  $\pi$ ,  $i$ , and  $-1$  have no existence.

II. Comment by G. B. M. ZERR, A. M., Ph. D., President and Professor of Mathematics, The Russell College, Lebanon, Va.

There may be a modern idea that since neither 6 nor 4 is a numbered quantity, the operation is impossible. If it were possible to get the evidence of all the mathematicians, I am sure not one could be found who did not learn his multiplication table, in fact, get his aptness in numbers by the same process as given in the problem. There may be some who claim otherwise but I would even doubt their claim.

$6 \times 4 = 24$  is good arithmetic. It seems a pity that vandals should make incursions upon the sacred shrines of Newton, La Place, Pierce, and other noted men of numbers, and so desecrate their immortal works, as to try and mistify their teachings. The God of Mathematics will not permit it.

III. Remarks by J. K. ELLWOOD, A. M., Principal of the Colfax School, Pittsburg, Pa.

Do  $4 \times 6 = 24$ ? Can 6 be multiplied by 4? Six what? If 6 units of quantity, yes; but if not a magnitude,—well, what then is it? "Six" apart from the universe of space, time, and matter, suggests to the mind—what? The "how many"? The *ratio* of the "how many" to the unit? Six in the abstract—a pure number—can not, in an arithmetical sense, be multiplied by any abstraction. In an algebraic sense,  $4 \times 6 = 24$ , just as  $x \times x = x^2$ . That is, we operate with *symbols*, neglecting the realities represented. If two abstract numbers can be multiplied one by the other, why not two concrete numbers, as feet  $\times$  feet = square feet?

42. Proposed by E. B. ESCOTT, Cambridge, Mass.

To find triangles whose sides and median lines are commensurable.

II. Solutions communicated to "L'Intermédiaire des Mathématiciens" (January, 1898) by the PROPOSER. Selected and translated by J. M. COLAW, A. M., Monterey, Va.

*First Solution.* By Chas. Gill (New York, 1848).

$x = t[1 - (\cos A + \sin A)(\cos B + \sin B)]$ ,  $y = t[\cos B - \sin B + (\cos A - \sin A)(\cos B + \sin B)]$ ,  $z = t[\cos A - \sin A + (\cos B - \sin B)(\cos A + \sin A)]$ , whence there exists one of the four relations following:

$\tan \frac{1}{2}A = (16 + 13\sin B - 8\cos B - 5\sin 2B - 2\sin^2 B) / [(2 + \sin B + 2\cos B)(5 + 4\sin B - 4\cos B)] \dots (I)$  ;  $\tan \frac{1}{2}A = [(1 - \sin B)(5 - \cos B + 4\sin B)] / [(\sin B + \cos B)(1 + 3\cos B - \sin B)] \dots (II)$  ;  $\cot \frac{1}{2}A = -(16 - 13\cos B + 8\sin B - 5\sin 2B - 2\cos^2 B) / [(2 - \cos B - 2\sin B)(5 + 4\sin B - 4\cos B)] \dots (III)$  ;  $\cot \frac{1}{2}A = [(1 + \cos B)(5 + \sin B - 4\cos B)] / [(\sin B + \cos B)(1 + \cos B - 3\sin B)] \dots (IV)$ . Letting, in formula (II),  $\sin B = \frac{4}{5}$ ,  $\cos B = -\frac{3}{5}$ , then  $\tan \frac{1}{2}A = -\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $x=262$ ,  $y=316$ ,  $z=254$ ,  $m_x=261$ ,  $m_y=204$ , and  $m_z=255$ .

*Second Solution.* From *The Gentleman's Mathematical Companion*, London, 1824, page 350.

Let  $z=x+y-d$ , then  $4m_z^2=x^2-2xy+y^2+2d(x+y)-d^2$ ;  $4m_y^2=4x^2+4xy+y^2-4d(x+y)+2d^2$ ;  $4m_x^2=x^2+4xy+4y^2-4d(x+y)+2d^2$ .

Let  $4x^2+4xy+y^2-4d(x+y)+2d^2=(2x+y-m)^2$ ; then  $x=(2d^2-4dy+2my-m^2)/(4d-4m)$ ,  $y=(2d^2-4dx+4mx-m^2)/(4d-2m)$ .

Let  $x^2+4xy+4y^2-4d(x+y)+2d^2=(x+2y-n)^2$ ; then  $x=(2d^2-4dy+2ny-n^2)/(4d-2n)$ ;  $y=(2d^2-4dx+2nx-n^2)/(4d-4n)$ .

$x=[d^2(4n-2m)+2d(m^2-n^2)-mn(2m-n)]/[4d(m+n)-6mn]$ ;

$y=[d^2(4m-2n)-2d(m^2-n^2)-mn(2n-m)]/[4d(m+n)-6mn]$ ;

$z=x+y-d=-[2d^2(m+n)-6mnd+mn(m+n)]/[4d(m+n)-6mn]$ .

We may neglect the common denominator  $4d(m+n)-6mn$ . We then have to satisfy the condition,  $2x^2+2y^2-z^2=36d^4(m-n)^2-24d^3(m+n)(2m^2-5mn+2n^2)+4d^2(4m^4+7m^2n-39m^2n^2+7mn^3+4n^4)-12dmn(m+n)(2m^2-5mn+2n^2)+9m^2n^2(m-n)^2=a$  square.

We have also  $=\{6d^2(m-n)-2d[(m+n)/(m-n)](2m^2-5mn+2n^2)-3mn(m-n)\}^2$ .

Whence  $d=[3(m+n)(m-n)^2]/(5m^2-8mn+5n^2)$ .

Letting  $m=3$ ,  $n=2$ ,  $d=\frac{1}{3}$ ,  $x=656$ ,  $y=414$ ,  $z=290$ ,

$m_x=142$ ,  $m_y=463$ ,  $m_z=529$ ,

$m=3$ ,  $n=1$ ,  $d=\frac{2}{3}$ ,  $x=174$ ,  $y=170$ ,  $z=136$ ,

$m_x=127$ ,  $m_y=131$ ,  $m_z=158$ ,

$m=3$ ,  $n=-1$ ,  $d=\frac{4}{3}$ ,  $x=650$ ,  $y=318$ ,  $z=628$ ,

$m_x=377$ ,  $m_y=619$ ,  $m_z=404$ ,

$m=5$ ,  $n=4$ ,  $d=\frac{3}{5}$ ,  $x=892$ ,  $y=554$ ,  $z=954$ ,

$m_x=640$ ,  $m_y=881$ ,  $m_z=569$ .

[*E. Fauquembergue* says, (*L' Intermediaire*, Mars 1897), that Euler, at different times busied himself with the problem of finding a triangle whose sides and medians are commensurable. His solution is reproduced in the *Commentationes Arithmeticae collectae*, t. II, page 488. He gives formulæ from which may be obtained an indefinite number of triangles answering the conditions of the problem. He deduces, among others, the solution with the integers 68, 85, 87 for the sides. See pages 94-95, of MONTHLY, Vol. IV, 1897, for solution I, by M. Tesch. EDITOR.]